

REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for considering the present application. In the Office Action dated January 14, 2005, Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Applicants have amended the specification to include Claims 21-23. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner for reconsideration.

Claim 1-6, 19, 7-15, 16-18 and 20 stands objected to for informalities. The independent claims have been amended to remove architectural and replace it with schematic.

With respect to Claim 8, Claim 8 is a dependent claim that recites a computer tomography system that includes the system of Claim 7. Claim 8 is narrower than Claim 1 in that the system is limited to a CT system.

Claims 1-8, 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over *Schleiss* (6,298,454) in view of *Williams* (5,754,451). Claims 9-14, 18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over *Schleiss* (6,298,454) in view of *Williams* (5,754,451) and *Taguchi* (5,807,256).

Claim 1 is directed to a diagnostic system for a data acquisition system that includes a computer controller coupled to the data acquisition system, a display device coupled to the computer controller. The computer controller receives data from the data acquisition system, diagnosing a problem in response to said data. The controller generates a screen display corresponding to a schematic representation of the data acquisition system. The controller generates screen indicia on the display device corresponding to a location of the problem on the schematic representation of the data acquisition system. Claim 1 has been amended to include that the controller generates a second screen display comprising a boxplot illustrating normalized raw data. This is illustrated in Figure 3 and is described in paragraph 18. The boxplot display is not taught or suggested in either the *Schleiss* or *Williams* reference. Independent Claim 7 has been amended in a similar manner to Claim 1.

Claim 16 is directed to a method that contains similar limitations with respect to the schematic representation of the data acquisition system and the screen indicia and the boxplot. Therefore, Claim 16 is also believed to be allowable for the same reasons set forth above. Likewise, Claims 2-6 are also believed to be allowable since they are dependent upon allowable independent claims. Therefore, as the teachings of the claims are not found in the combination of the *Schleiss* reference and the *Williams* reference, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner for reconsideration.

The remaining dependent claims are believed to be allowable for the same reasons set forth above. *Taguchi* also does not teach a normalized boxplot.

Applicants respectfully believe that all rejections are overcome. Should the Examiner have any further questions or comments, the Examiner is directed to contact the undersigned directly. Please charge any fees required in the filing of this amendment to deposit account 50,0476.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin G. Mierzwa
Registration No. 38,049
Attorney for Applicant

Date: 3-4-05

Artz & Artz, PC
28333 Telegraph Road, Suite 250
Southfield, Michigan 48034
(248) 223-9500